

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/723,755

Applicant(s)

STOBIE ET AL.

Examiner

Zheng Wei

Art Unit

2192

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Tuan Q. Dam.

(3) Jens C. Jenkins (Reg#: 44803).

(2) Zheng Wei.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 05 February 2008.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: _____

Claim(s) discussed: 15-17, 42-44.


Identification of prior art discussed: Johnson et al.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.



TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

- (1) The Applicant clarified the main invention of current application and addressed the difference to the prior art Johnson.
- (2) The Applicant presented the proposed amendment claims to further indicate the difference between the first verification level and second level.
- (3) The Examiner pointed out that some terms used in the proposed claims may raise 35 U.S.C. § 112 issues regarding "insert record object" for different verification levels as cited in claims 17, 42-44
- (4) The Examiner is waiting for the official amendment for further prosecution.